

**College of Arts and Sciences
Dean's Council of Department Chairs
Wednesday, April 17, 2013**

Attended

Angela Biselli, Chair of Physics
Jocelyn Boryczka, Chair of Politics
Matt Coleman, Chair of Mathematics & Computer Science
Jean Daniele, CAS Assistant to the Dean
Joy Gordon, Chair of Philosophy
David Gudelunas, Chair of Communication & Director of Women Gender & Sexuality Studies
Olivia Harriott, Chair of Biology
Hugh Humphrey, on behalf of the Chair of Religious Studies
Manyul Im, CAS Associate Dean
Terry-Ann Jones, Director of International Studies
Matthew Kubasik, on behalf of the Chair of Chemistry
Mark LeClair, Chair of Economics
Laura Nash, Chair of Visual & Performing Arts
Aaron Perkus, CAS Associate Dean
Elizabeth Petrino, Chair of English
Susan Rakowitz, on behalf of the Chair of Psychology
Kurt Schlichting, Chair of Sociology & Anthropology
James Simon, CAS Associate Dean
Yohuru Williams, Chair of History & Director of Black Studies

Regrets

Nancy Dallavalle, Chair of Religious Studies
Judy Primavera, Chair of Psychology
Kraig Steffen, Chair of Chemistry & Biochemistry
Marie-Agnes Sourieau, Chair of Modern Languages and Literatures and Director of Italian Studies

Approval of the Minutes

Dr. Jocelyn Boryczka moved to approve the March 20, 2013 Dean's Council minutes and Dr. Terry Ann Jones seconded the motion. Dr. Petrino asked that her comment on page two reflect a question, rather than a statement. Ms. Daniele will make the appropriate changes. Six chairs approved the minutes with seven abstentions.

Syllabi Archives – Aaron Perkus & Manyul Im

Rationale—Dr. Perkus mentioned that a request was made by Joan Overfield, University Librarian and Director of Library Services, to have access to syllabi, so they could know what books to order on occasion. The professional school accreditation required them to archive all syllabi. The CAS does not have a systematic archive of all syllabi taught through the college. The question is whether we want to have a systematic approach to archiving all syllabi. Perkus is often approached by visiting students requesting a copy of the course syllabus to see if a course would be accepted by a home institution. It is often difficult to obtain a copy of the syllabus; it would be much easier if the College had an archive for all syllabi. The Dean

mentioned that we receive request from former students, who are trying to get requirements waived for graduate school. It is best to have the syllabus from the semester the student took the course.

The Dean mentioned that in the past chairs were required to archive syllabi. They were previously collected in the department and stored in the Dean's office. We would not want to go back to this routine, where we collect and distribute paper on such a large scale. Perkus mentioned that his sense is that syllabi are already being sent to the program assistants, but he is unsure of the process beyond this. The easiest procedure may be to store the syllabi into a Xythos folder.

The Dean asked chairs how they were collecting and storing syllabi.

- Dr. LeClair mentioned that his syllabi were up on his webpage. In the department they are collecting for their external review. In the past they collected paper copies but stopped archiving.
- Dr. Petrino: What should a chair do if a junior faculty member expresses discontent about the University on Facebook? What level of intervention should take place?
- Dr. Biselli mentioned that they are trying to gather and archive
- Dr. Nash shared that the VPA collects their syllabi semester by semester and archives them.
- Dr. Gudelunas mentioned that the Communication department archives by course number by semester and archives them in Xythos.
- The Dean mentioned that all of the assistants should know all of the banner and Xythos routines. They have ample opportunities to engage in training for these functions.
- Dr. Gordon had objections to archiving within departments. Faculty expressed concerns with publicly storing their syllabi. Associate Dean Im shared that the syllabi would not be public. It would only be accessed by a member of the University staff if there was a particular request for a particular semester for a legitimate purpose. Gordon shared that faculty deal with incoming request individually. The Dean asked what would happen when a faculty retires and there is a request for their syllabi. The Dean is not opposed to only the department having access.
- The Library reviews emerging titles on an ongoing basis, because they want more familiarity of what faculty are teaching. Gordon felt that this was not a way for the Library to order books. Faculty should inform them what they should have relative to their topic of teaching.
- Dr. Harriott mentioned that the Biology Department was concerned with what was going to happen with the syllabi information. It really depends on what information is on the syllabus. Some are very detailed.
- Dr. Williams shared that the History Department puts their syllabi on Xythos. Williams shared that he was in favor of the archive. He recently worked with Marsha Alibrandi, on a situation where a student from Tulane had all of her records lost. They spent a few days trying to find out if the courses counted towards certification as a teacher. The archive would have helped in this situation. It is a good reason to have a system in place, as long as it is not public.
- Associate Dean Simon mentioned that the easiest practical way to engage in assessment would be to look at the syllabi to see learning outcomes.

- Dr. Coleman mentioned that the Math/CS Department has the Program Assistant collect syllabi electronically and stores it on her computer.
- Dr. Schlichting shared that the Sociology/Anthropology department assistant collects syllabi and files by faculty or semester.
- The Dean asked if the chairs would be in favor of department having an electronic archiving process in place. It should be on Xythos, rather than on the assistant's computer. Departments could implement whatever protocol they would want in terms of who would have access to their syllabi. The Dean's office needs the ability to request a particular semester syllabi and departments need the ability to find them easily. Having archived syllabi could be used to share with adjuncts to show them different approaches of teaching a course.
- The Dean shared that the University has an archive of every single catalog. We have a course schedule for every semester. She asked Perkus to find out the Library's existing mechanisms for working with department and/or faculty to order books. What are additional mechanism that might be attempted?
- Associate Dean Im mentioned that one general point is that library staff is a good team and would like to be more engaged with faculty to display their resources. They want to be as useful as possible supporting faculty research and pedagogy.
- Dr. Humphrey added that the library makes e-copies available to students.
- It was agreed that department program assistants will upload syllabi on Xythos either semester by semester or course by course. Perkus suggested that the College has Jay Rozgonyi, Academic Director of Computer and Network Services create a template on Xythos for uploading procedures. Perkus will reach out to Mr. Rozgonyi and follow up with Ms. Overfield with suggestions made.

Diversity Follow-Up – Manyul Im

During the 2012 CAS Chairs' Retreat, Dr. Susan Pilner, an expert in Diversity issues in higher education, held a workshop around Diversity issues. The Dean's Council engaged in a number of follow up issues. It is important to the Dean, Associate Deans, and to faculty that we have an ongoing conversation on diversity.

Dr. Im mentioned it was unclear where data around diversity among faculty is stored. The Dean commented that we are now federally mandated to collect this type of data, and Human Resources sent out a request to all employees of the University to complete a form. Im added that we are also mandated to collect the data from job applicants.

The Dean explained that Mark Guglielmoni, Director of Human Resources, is looking into a system that will allow candidates to self-identify. As applications come into Human Resources, we are looking at a third party, who will send out a post card with appropriate questions to collect data. She asked Institutional Research and Human Resources to do some analysis of the data that we collect, but has not received a response from HR; IR is currently looking into generating different kinds of analysis of this data, such as disaggregating responses by demographic group. Dr. Im could not get in touch with either HR or IR but manage to obtain some details of the new data collection (handout was shared). The Dean noted that data should not just be collected, but analyzed, collectively reflected upon, and reported to the University community.

Dr. Im went to the FDC to request that they take an informational survey and some research in thinking about special programs for addressing needs that are different among faculty. They agreed to take this up as one of their main focuses and will work with CAE to gather this information. Boryczka shared that Dr. Ann Stehney engaged in a massive survey with this type of data. This was rich data and shared with upper management. Im added that a lot of research went into this analysis but based on the design it was not too useful. The Dean added that we should be taking a stance that we are all responsible for producing an inclusive culture. In the Dean's office we are trying to "lead up". As well, Department chairs in CAS are some of the most important leaders on campus in terms of getting things institutionalized.

Dr. LeClair mentioned that the difficulty their department encountered was that 75-80% of their candidates are on visas. When he contacted HR to post their search and complete the analysis of the applicants he felt uncomfortable making judgments based on too little information and no self-report. LeClair added that when talking to HR about categorizing candidates, the categorization is different dependent on whether they have citizenship. This may be something that FDEC should consider, as well.

The Dean commented that the President's Institutional Diversity Council should be assessing the diversity of the institutions climate, advancing the institution and advising the president on what should be done. Having as much pressure, on as many fronts, to have proper HR protocol would be helpful. A centralized on-line application submission system would be a good process to follow; all state institutions follow this protocol. The Dean explained to HR the importance behind not just collecting the data, but disaggregating and analyzing the data. There needs to be some communication back to the community about how the University is doing. Dr. Boryczka mentioned that PIDC does not address this particular HR issues by design. They worked very hard to differentiate themselves from questions around EEOC matters. The Dean noted that it is not for PIDC to *do* the HR work, but to advocate for HR and other systems to be in place.

Dr. Gordon commented that the Philosophy Department is not an area where there is a large amount of international applicants. Is there a way, other than our resources on campus, to identify these situations and learn more? The Dean commented that she will reach out to Mark Reed to ask if there is an attorney that we could have a conversation with around these types of cases. Dr. Terry-Ann Jones shared that she had a negative experience with Human Resources at the time of her hire. In her case, they referred her to an attorney that turned out to be a divorce attorney, who quipped that she could get married to a U.S. citizen to facilitate the process. They do not handle these types of situations properly.

Dr. Im added interest in determining if we have a retention issue with regards to faculty of color. The Dean shared that she has a good sense of this type of information, within the College, for the past 10 years. She could only speak to what she had witnessed personally since there is not formal data. She has communicated the need for this, copying the President and the relevant Vice Presidents. We want to see if we are making progress as an institution and learn of the challenges. Sometimes we lose faculty, because of geography or personal circumstances. In the aggregate data we are hiring well but our overall stats are not changing over time. We do want to track reasons why people leave, but we also need to be mindful of the lack of progress.

As a next step, the Dean is willing to send faculty to conferences and workshops. There are facilitators that she is willing to bring in to engage in department-based work. The reviews of

the engagement with Susan Pilner were mixed; part of the problem being the time allotment and the level of engagement, etc. Im mentioned that diversity training for students may be helpful as a next step. They do not understand, for instance, how to handle authority figures that they are not accustomed to seeing.

Dr. Gudelunas mentioned that an exit interview would be helpful in determining reasons for resignation. Dr. Williams commented that data from an exit survey would also be beneficial. He would like to compare this against the reasons why other non-faculty resigns from the University. All of this data would be helpful in hiring and articulating to faculty what should be expected in the classroom.

Dr. Boryczka commented on Dr. Gordon's diversity workshop that she put together a few years back, funded by a Humanities Institute Grant. She found this to be a very rich workshop around issues related to race, gender, sexual orientation, and class. Gordon mentioned that the purpose of the workshop was to build out strengths in areas around core courses. In what ways are we not effectively teaching to students of color, managing classroom conversations and dynamics related to diversity, etc.? The workshop involved students (activists and recent grads) who shared their experiences. The Dean recalls this workshop and commented that this was successful, because it was faculty organized for their own purpose, making it more powerful. It had been funded through a Humanities Institute grant.

Dr. Terry-Ann Jones shared that she had lunch with students and their conversation shifted to gatherings on campus and how a lot of students of color are tired of having to engage in these types of conversations to educate everyone else. We should use the larger student body to teach them about these issues. Boryczka also hears of these issues quite frequently too.

Dr. Williams shared that MLK had a march on campus. They went back to look at incidents on campus relative to race, class, and gender. The most powerful was about "Fags for Fairfield". He recalls that his students, who were required to attend, were shocked that this happened, because they are accustomed to political correctness.

Dr. Schlichting commented that first generation cuts across this; it is difficulty for first generation students.

Dr. Harriott asked why diversity training cannot be mandatory for all employees, situating it as management training.

The Dean asked that chairs forward any other thoughts or comments to Associate Dean Im. He is spearheading these issues with other on-campus groups.

Annual Performance Review ("merit")

- System will be going live by end of April; there will need to be a quick turnaround, as usual. Faculty should write essays in word document and have them ready. List of reviewers and faculty were sent to C&NS so the system will be ready when/if we have an MOU.
- Academic Council based that faculty tenured and/or promoted would automatically qualify for standard merit.

- Pre-tenure faculty who get continuing contracts renewed also do not have to apply for standard merit. Faculty with terminal contract may apply.
- Dr. Im commented that the timing for chairs recommendations for renewal may be problematic, in relation to when faculty merit applications are due. The Dean is putting this on the Planning Committee agenda, revisions to the College Merit Plan, because some other difficulties have been pointed out, as well.
- POPs are eligible to apply; visiting faculty not eligible.
- Dean asked that chairs ensure their review committee members are engaged
- Formative Reviews should take place within departments. With pre-tenure faculty this is going on. The dean hopes this is also going on for senior faculty. Some departments pair up and have conversations. English Department has developed mentoring committees for tenured faculty. The University-wide Merit Plan does state that formative conversations are important, and that these should occur in the departments.
- Merit details in terms of timing will follow; they are still waiting on an MOU.
- Staff Reviews—Ms. Daniele is the staff supervisor for the operational staff in the College of Arts and Sciences. She shared with official supervisors the protocol for this year’s staff reviews. Assistants within in the College often support more than one department and/or program, in which case all chairs/directors should engage in a collaborative conversation around the performance of their assistant. The assessment should include the input from all areas.
- Dr. Gordon showed some concerns relative to the protocol for staff reviews. There was e-mail communication between Ms. Jean Daniele and Dr. Gordon relative to her concerns. Ms. Daniele shared the procedures that she follows for annual review of the operational staff in the Dean’s office. Dr. Gordon was in agreement with most of the procedures mapped out but still had a few concerns. Her view relative to annual assessments comes from her involvement with being on the board of a small nonprofit for many years, where she served on the personnel committee for over a decade. It was similar in that there were very few employees, and little money available for salary increases. She was committed to an annual review process that was conducted thoughtfully, transparently, and respectfully. Everyone sits down to discuss how this is working for each other. If a staff person is good they tend to become invisible. Support staff are often noticed only when there are problems; if they are very good we have a tendency not to notice them.
- Ms. Daniele addressed her concerns in a previous e-mail, sharing the following process.
 - Set up a time to meet with the appropriate deans for a collaborative discussion, adding their comments and collectively deciding on an appropriate ranking for each category.
 - Once the evaluation is completed, share our comments with the Dean to receive her final approval/comments (this has been done to help chairs learn how to do effective reviews and to generate some calibration across the College)
 - Send each assistant a copy of their evaluation prior to my scheduled meeting with them, so they have an opportunity to review the comments beforehand.
 - During the meeting highlight strong points, appreciation for their contribution to the workflow of our office, as well as the University, and offer some recommendations in terms of continued professional development or in some cases areas that may need further development by suggesting resources or tactics to help further development.

- The performance review is an open conversation, where our assistants feel comfortable commenting on the evaluation and rankings, share their suggestions and comments they have relative to the office dynamics, their workflow, or at times we talk about best practices for particular projects etc...
- The final process is to give our assistant time to read over their assessment and add their comments to the assessment form, before sending this off to Human Resources.
- Everyone sits down and asks how it is working for supervisor and support staff. Support staff notice when there is problems. If they are very good you tend not to notice. You do not automatically think about them.
- The Dean mentioned that program assistants across the College do not have the same jobs. This is a challenge in terms of categorization and what their job description reads. She is not sure that the job descriptions are up-to-date. Ms. Daniele will check on when these descriptions were reviewed by Human Resources. Everyone's job description evolves overtime with new technology, systems, etc.
- The Dean's office just went through this process, looking at the work that needs to be done and how it is best distributed. With the program assistants, because they are a category, the job descriptions are pretty generic with other duties assigned by the chair.
- Dr. Gordon commented that supervisors seems to take for granted that their support staff are happy, because they do not erupt, but this does not necessarily mean they are happy or comfortable how they are being treated or with their workload. It is not until supervisors sit with their support staff and have a conversation of how things are working for them and how they are working for their supervisor.
- Dr. Schlichting disagreed, stating that there are constant positive comments about their program assistant and he does not think assistants are invisible.
- Review of the Dean—Dr. Aaron Perkus and the CAS Associate Deans are looking into a way of collecting feedback on the Dean. There is no performance review for the deans. There is not a formal process. A few years ago, the CAS Staff collected comments that were aggregated and shared with the Dean. Chairs will receive an e-mail prompt, asking for their feedback. Dr. Perkus expressed interest in hearing thoughts from chairs that have experience in participating in something similar to a 360-degree evaluation. The Dean mentioned there is a current job description in the College Governance Document. Perkus mentioned that he would add this job description when reaching out for confidential feedback.

Announcements and Routine Issues

- Associate Dean Simon thanked colleagues for their help in putting the A&S Awards Ceremony together and hopes to see them Tuesday, April 23.
- The process was inherited by the former Dean Timothy Snyder, so it may be time to take a fresh look at the process for this event.
- There were 59 submissions for College-wide awards. Committees were impressed with the quality of student work.
- In terms of departmental awards, Dr. Simon received a lot of criticism from some departments relative to the "one student per award." There Dean suggested a committee of either the chairs, College Planning Committee, or another form of the faculty body to discuss changes in policies/procedures to look for a way to handle this event, keeping in mind that the students remain the paramount of this event.

- The Dean commended Dr. Simon for managing this major event, which can be very challenging.
- Dr. Boryczka shared her concerns of the department about the selection of awards presented during this event. She sent Dr. Simon a detailed memo that came from a serious conversation among the Politics Department, asking him to share this with CAS directors and chairs. The problem is not based on the size of the department or trying to make everyone happy, but rather, that this is the one opportunity of the year to celebrate the hard work of students and faculty. The Politics Department wanted to celebrate Dr. John Orman, as well as an award the department distributed for twenty-five years. She understands the arguments behind the one-award policy, but it placed the department in a difficult position. If this has been going on for five years, and all these complaints have been registered, we should have been talking about these concerns earlier. Boryczka would hope that the sub-committee would not consist of folks that are not accustomed to administering these awards, but rather the chairs and directors directly associated with the distribution of these awards. She would rather see an inclusive process efficiently run that comes out of a democratic decision making process, rather than from one that is imposed. She was upset that there was not enough time to discuss this situation in greater detail. The Politics Department decided not to participate in the CAS Awards Ceremony to register their discontent about the process. They would like the opportunity to engage in a conversation about the process in an engaged an inclusive way.
- Dr. Simon mentioned that if these concerns came out in September, they could have been addressed, but he received these concerns two weeks prior to this major event. There is a large scope of responsibilities in organizing this event.
- The Dean apologized for not getting to this agenda item in each of the last two Dean's Council meetings, as it was on her list of topics to discuss since February. The Dean's reply to Dr. Boryczka's emailed concerns (copying chairs and directors) was that there will be conversation about the process and the current practices grew out of the Dean's Council body, given so much change in this body. These decisions become norms and practices that end up having a life of their own, with annual routines that are passed from Associate Dean to Associate Dean. These are practices more than policies. We do want to have a process that looks at what we have done—what works and does not work—and what we should do moving forward. She is happy to entertain whatever recommendations emerge from the process Dr. Simon will lead next fall.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.